10¢

April-May 1961
Vol. 4, Nos. 4-5

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST®

Will the Future Redeem the Past?

An Address by

THE HONORABLE CHARLES MALIK

Former President of the United Nations General Assembly

Dr. Malik helped to frame the principles of the United Nations at San Francisco, and has been a delegate from his native Lebanon throughout the life of the United Nations; he was elected President of the United Nations General Assembly in 1959. He studied at the American University of Beirut, at the University of Freiburg in Germany, and at Harvard University, where he earned his Doctor of Philosophy degree. Two of his books are read around the world: WAR AND PEACE (1950) and THE PROBLEMS OF ASIA (1951). He holds honorary degrees from more than a dozen American colleges and universities.

The following address, delivered at the Eighteenth-Century Capitol of Williamsburg, Virginia, on June 11, 1960, is reprinted with the kind permission of Colonial Williamsburg Incorporated.

I

There is something mysterious about history. The commonest reflection on history is that it does not stand still. This means that "it" "flows." What is this "it" that flows, and what is this "flowing" which seems to be inseparable from "it"? These are mysterious questions. Surely there is no river in front of us that flows, and yet we immovably persist in maintaining that whatever history is, "it" is something that "moves," that "flows." We are using therefore an image, an analogy. I suggest that what we mean by this analogy of the "movement" or the "flow" of history is that there is something uncertain about any assessment of the past. When I make a historical judgment, "it does not stand still"; I may change it tomorrow; or even if the judgment is "immovable," its significance in history and for history may radically alter tomorrow.

I propose today to meditate briefly on the past decade or two and to look ahead to the coming decade or two. I have been led to this undertaking partly through the inspiration of the whole concept of Colonial Williamsburg and its majestic execution, whose purpose is so perfectly expressed in its motto, "That the future may learn from the past"; partly because of the critical nature of the present moment of history. I perform this meditation at "this point" in time, namely, at the threshold of the sixties of the twentieth century. "History flows" or "moves on" means that history has not "yet" delivered all that with which "it" is pregnant, that history has not "come to an end," that 'it" continues to be in labor and will deliver still more, that the last word, not only *about* the past that is "finished and done away with," but especially *of* the past and its "place" in the determination of the present and the future, has not "yet" been said, and that therefore the "present" meditation may have to be altered more or less appreciably one year or five years or ten

years from now. What I say today then must be viewed under four essential limitations. (1) I do not have all the facts before me, not only the enormous multiplicity of known and ascertainable facts, but especially the secrets under lock and key in the archives of governments and of other organizations bearing upon history. (2) When all the facts are before me, not only will the picture be more complete in the sense of including everything, but my judgment of the nature and importance even of the known or ascertainable facts may have to undergo considerable modification. (3) Even an indisputable disastrous fact, such as the communization of mainland China, could take on a completely different meaning in the light of future decisions and future developments. And (4) I view the decisiveness of the present moment in history as consisting in a life-and-death struggle between International Communism, not only nor even primarily as an economic system, but as a total outlook on life, and the rest of the world, especially the Western world, and in the Western world especially the United States of America; and because of my knowledge of its ultimate positive values, as epitomized in part, for instance,, in the magnificent language of the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776, I range myself wholly on the side of the West, despite its many imperfections, mistakes, failures, and sins. It is this fundamental conviction and my free self-ranging on one side of the life-and-death struggle that enable me, for instance, to say that the communization of mainland China was "disastrous"; and I view everything from the standpoint of this conviction and this self-ranging. Thus I agree with the following finding of the international Communist congress which gathered together in Moscow in November of 1957 for the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Russian October Revolution and which was attended by delegates from sixty-five Communist parties representing a total membership all over the world of thirty-three million: that the international stage is the scene today "of the competition between two diametrically opposed . . . world outlooks, . . . the Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism," on the one hand, and every other outlook, on the other. (*Pravda*, November 22, 1957.) And General de Gaulle, who is one of the authoritative voices of the West, only last week said: "The division of the peoples that inhabit Europe and North America is the main fact and the worst evil of our time. Two camps are set up, face to face, under conditions such that it depends solely on Moscow or Washington whether or not a large part of humanity is wiped out in a few hours." (*The New York Times*, Wednesday, June 1, 1960).

II

Under these four limitations we may now work out a provisional balance sheet of the last two decades. On the credit side the free world and especially the West can congratulate itself on a number of things. Fascism has been routed. There has been a remarkable European recovery, thanks partly to the Marshall Plan, partly and in the first instance to the vigor of the European peoples themselves with their great economic, political, and spiritual institutions. The Atlantic Alliance has forged the most important unity of purpose and strength in the face of Communism in the world. From the point of view of preparedness, the West, despite the sensational achievements of the Soviet Union, is relatively very strong. The greater part of Germany appears to be permanently integrated into the West. The advance of Communism is halted and slightly reversed in France and Italy. From the point of view of military alignment, Yugoslavia is detached from Moscow. Despite constant sources of danger, both internal and external, Greece and Turkey, thanks in part to the Truman Doctrine, have not been overrun or neutralized. Communism has so far been prevented from spilling over into Iran. Japan has considerably recovered, and despite Communist agitation and infiltration Japan remains an ally of the West. The defensive alliances in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia stand as watchful guardians against the advance of Communism in their areas. The domain of freedom, so far as national liberation is concerned, has considerably increased through the emergence of Asia and Africa into independent nationhood. Generous programs of technical and economic assistance developed by the United States and other countries, and to a small extent by the United Nations also, have helped in easing the lot of the less fortunate and promoting their peaceful development. The end of the Stalinist tyranny is an important event in the total sweep of history. There is a more widespread understanding in the free world of the nature and goals of Communism than ever before through the immense literature that has lately poured forth on this subject, and through the increasing interest that the universities and schools are taking in it. Events in the Far East, in Asia, in the Middle East, and in Eastern Europe have opened the eyes of many people to the real facts of life with respect to international Communism. Marxist predictions have been scandalously belied so far as the resiliency and increasing prosperity of the free world, and especially of the West, is concerned. Despite its normal inner strains democracy is flourishing at least in Western Europe and in North America. The United Nations has not broken up; it includes now practically everybody, and disputes and situations can be debated in its halls and world public opinion could have some effect upon them. Increasing cultural and other exchanges between East and West have contributed to a climate of greater understanding and trust. Despite the local flare-ups here and there, general peace has been maintained throughout the world.

These are solid achievements. When one closely and fully considers each one of them, one can obtain real hope and comfort. The free world has not been altogether passive and remiss during these years: on the contrary, it manifested alertness, responsibility, imagination, and bold thinking. A general awakening has since the Second World War resulted in building up a complex international machinery for the defense of the free world. If this was the only record of the last two decades so far as the gigantic world struggle of the moment is concerned, then the outlook for this struggle would be altogether hopeful and bright from the point of view of the West.

III

However, we must face on the debit side a series of depressing facts. Communism started from zero forty-three years ago and today it rigidly controls one-third of mankind and has penetrated and softened up in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds: was this phenomenal development inevitable? The victory of Communism in the late forties in China means that the largest compactly homogeneous mass of humanity, numbering some 600 million people, are now sworn enemies of everything free and Western: was this development inevitable? The Korean War, despite all its heroic exertions, ended in a draw: was this outcome inevitable? In Southeast Asia there has

(Continued on page 4)

WELCOME TO THE PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE CEREMONY

By WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER

Condensed from the opening remarks by W. Rockefeller, Chairman of the Boards, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. and Williamsburg Restoration, Inc. Reprinted with the kind permission of Colonial Williamsburg.

Our meeting this year comes at a time when Colonial Williamsburg is entering a new phase of its life. For the past 35 years the Restoration has known my father's deeply personal interest in restoring the eighteenth-century capital of the Virginia colony.

It was his earnest wish that the Restoration should maintain the broad foundations of scholarship, interpretation, and presentation on which it is based. Those of us who are stewards of the Restoration today are determined that the standards my father set shall not be diminished.

I should add that as a result of his foresight, Colonial Williamsburg has both the leadership and the material resources necessary for the continuance of its programs of historic preservation and education.

As an example of our educational activities, we have as our guests tonight an outstanding group of 58 graduate students from 42 countries who are here for the fourth Williamsburg International Assembly.

These students from abroad are especially welcome. We hope they will take back to their native lands memories of these moments in this historic building which occupies a very special place in American history. It was the political training ground for many of the leaders of the struggle for independence.

As such, it is symbolic of the present day meaning of Williamsburg. My father, who was deeply interested in the significance of the Restoration, once said:

"Williamsburg has a lesson for us today. We can always learn from great men. The men of colonial Williamsburg were individuals. They had the courage to be themselves and to do what they thought was right. That is the lesson we can learn."

He felt that the Restoration went much deeper than the saving or reconstruction of eighteenth-century buildings alone.

His concept, "That the future may learn from the past," is of guiding importance to us. And by that, my father meant not only the American future, but the world future. He believed that there is something of value to be learned here by men of all nations as we continue our search for peace and international understanding based on justice.

As part of this concept and to make certain that an important chapter of our history is not forgotten, we celebrate each year the fifty days from May 15 to July 4. In the year 1776 these days formed an important Williamsburg period we know as the Prelude to Independence. Many of the first steps toward our freedom were taken during that period. On May 15, 1776, the convention of delegates meeting here passed the Virginia Resolution for American Independence. This led directly to the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia on July 4th.

The delegates assembled here also wrote a state constitution, and elected Patrick Henry as the first governor of Virginia.

And it was here on June 12, 184 years ago that the Virginia Declaration of Rights was unanimously adopted.

Our purpose tonight is to recall the significance of this document—one of the great statements of the natural rights of man. After its passage here, many of its principles became the basis for the first ten amendments to the constitution of the United States which we call the federal Bill of Rights.

These and many other historic actions are, in brief, the heart of our educational and interpretation program here in Colonial Williamsburg.

For those who can come to Williamsburg — and they number nearly one million each year — we have no formal curriculum, no classrooms, or final examinations. We offer a living textbook of history.

To those who have not yet visited Williamsburg or who wish to learn more about our history, Colonial Williamsburg offers classroom and other school materials, seminars in many fields, books and general publications, films, research assistance for scholars, and many other services.

For example, I am happy to report that approximately 60,000 children from more than 1,100 schools visited us in groups last year. Under our foreign visit program more than 200 political and professional leaders came here last year in addition to 3,000 other visitors from more than 80 countries.

Those who visit here—both Americans and those from abroad—learn something about the everyday life, thoughts, and attitudes of a century that saw the republic conceived, born, and begin its life in the family of nations.

It seems worth remembering in these days of international crises and the race for outer space that much can still be found in the pattern set nearly two centuries ago by our forefathers. Their devotion to the common good, to responsible leadership, and to principles of freedom can refresh our spirits and provide guidance today.

WILL THE FUTURE REDEEM THE PAST?

(Continued from page 2)

occurred during the last ten years an advance of Communism and a retreat of freedom: was this advance and retreat inevitable? Whereas international Communism was effectively absent from the Middle East ten or fifteen years ago, and in the consideration of Middle-Eastern problems Communism was treated as though it did not exist, international Communism enters decisively today into the determination of every Middle-Eastern problem: was this development inevitable? Whereas ten or fifteen years ago Communism was effectively absent from Latin America, today it is visibly present: was this development inevitable? The Communist Party, receiving orders directly from Moscow, is certainly more active and influential today in Asia and Africa than ten years ago, and several responsible United States officials said recently that the Communists have markedly intensified their activity in the United States: was this penetration inevitable?

Backing international Communism as its embodiment and vehicle is the most superbly organized international political party in history, the Communist Party, with the most advanced techniques of intellectual, social, economic, and political penetration and subversion ever devised: was the impotence of the West in developing any comparable counter-force inevitable? Backing international Communism materially is the second most industrially advanced state in the world, the Soviet Union, which might at the present rate of development surpass the United States in two decades: was this discrepancy in the rates of growth, and in the dates of change of the rates of growth, between East and West inevitable? This supporting industrial base appears to command atomic and nuclear weapons in abundance, whereas ten or fifteen years ago the United States had a monopoly of these weapons: was this decline in Western relative strength inevitable? We are today more than two years and eight months since Sputnik I, and while the West has made enormous advances in rocketry, it is not clear that in this revolutionary technological field it has caught up with the Soviet Union so far as thrust power is concerned: is this persistent lag inevitable? In the matter of economic international competition there is no comparison between the economic status of the Communist world today and its status ten years ago: was this decline in Western relative economic strength inevitable?

The visible struggle appears to occur all on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains: in Europe, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in the Far East, in Latin America; and when people expect a crisis to break out tomorrow, they do not expect it in Albania or Rumania or Russia or China, but in the home of freedom; freedom then is on the defensive and not Communism: is it fated that the West should be always on the defensive, always reacting? The West today appears gladly to welcome neutralism in areas in which it would not have countenanced this phenomenon a decade ago: was this constant retreat of Western influence inevitable? In the nascent nationalism of Asia and Africa, which is otherwise a natural and good thing, there is an admixture in varying degrees of anti-Westernism, if not pro-Communism that leads to anti-Westernism: was this spread of anti-Westernism as a concomitant of the growth of nationalism inevitable? In the very nations that have attained the dignity of political freedom and independence other dimensions of freedom have been severely curtailed, namely, personal freedom, intellectual freedom, social freedom, spiritual freedom: was this contraction of the domain of freedom inevitable? Communist literature has during this decade inundated Asia, Africa, and Latin-America in relation to non-Communist literature: was this advance in the relative abundance of Communist literature inevitable? Communism has been more persistent and effective in presenting to the Asian and African mind a well-thought-out interpretation of existence, the Marxist-Leninist ideology, than any outlook that has been forthcoming from the West: was this timidity in the articulation of the ideology of freedom inevitable? The apparent unity of purpose and action among the international Communists impresses the Asian and African mind, whereas the squabbles among the members of the Western family produce an air of internal division and weakness: were these squabbles and divisions inevitable?

The simple fact that the free world has not succeeded in forty years in pushing back the tide of Communism by one inch from where it really got political control leaves the strong impression that we are here dealing with an irresistible and irreversible thrust which will inevitably inherit and transform in its own image all the kingdoms and cultures of the earth: is this creeping tide of Communism completely irreversible? Perhaps the most distressing fact is the self-satisfaction and self-congratulation that prevails in the West; the softness, the laxity, the lack of determination and decisiveness, the general decadence, the uncritical readiness to settle for "peaceful coexistence": are we then face to face with some ineluctable judgment of fate or God?

IV

In terms of the ultimate world struggle, how are we to assess the net performance of the immediate past from the comparison of the two sides of the balance sheet which I have just drawn up? I can draw the provisional conclusion that while things could have been much worse, in my opinion they could have decidedly been much better. International Communism is today on an over-all basis relatively stronger than ten or fifteen years ago, and the free world is relatively weaker; there is a marked over-all advance by the one and a corresponding over-all retreat by the other. In history it is impossible at any moment to work out a neat, final balance sheet, for at no moment "in history" does history come to an end. It all depends then on the future. The future could redeem the past or it could confirm it. But it will redeem nothing unless the question of the inevitability or otherwise of the developments of the immediate past is first squarely and honestly faced. For either you believe that these things were inevitable or you believe that they could have been helped. If you believe that they were inevitable; namely, that the outcome of the struggle in China, in Korea, in Indochina; that the Communist penetration of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America; that the absence of any effective counteracting force to the Communist Party; that the relative decline in Western influence and Western economic and military strength; etc. —if you believe that all these developments of the fifties of the twentieth century *could not have been helped, then you are already a Marxist.* For Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev hold firmly (and Khrushchev repeats it everyday) that the iron laws of history are precisely such that whatever happens, Communism will come out on top. Therefore to them, and to you if you believe in the inevitability

of these developments, namely, if you refuse to assume moral responsibility for them, the Communist advance and the Western retreat did not come about by accident: the universe was such, history was such, the nature of human society and its development was such, the economic, social, and political situation in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America was such, that the advance and the retreat *had to take place*. I warn you therefore against declining to assume full moral-historical responsibility for what happened during the last two decades: for if you do so you are already a Marxist and Marxian Communism will have already won in your soul.

The only hope therefore is to believe *on a basis of truth and not of darkness or sentiment or dogmatism* that nothing of what transpired was inevitable, and that everything could have been prevented or reversed. Only on the basis of radical moral responsibility can you overcome the fatalism of the cosmologists and the determinism of the dialectical materialists. The future will never redeem the past and we will only pass from one fiasco to another, from one pathetic drift to another, unless in contemplating the past we can put our finger with certainty on such and such an act and such and such a decision and such and such a person, and honestly say that this act or decision or person *could have been different* and therewith the course of events would have taken a radically different turn. If only people rose to the occasion, if only they were not overwhelmed by their softness and apathy, if only they overcame their greed, if only they were morally strong, if only they were not selfish and narrow, if only they were not petty and spiteful and stupid, if only they were big, if only they knew what was at stake, if only they were not hypocritical, if only they trampled under foot the wide and easy way!

I know of more than one instance in which precisely and only because people lacked some of these moral perfections we are where we are today.

V

I shall not go into any detailed moral-historical-political evaluation of the past. Taking upon ourselves the whole moral guilt of the past, believing that the present would have been entirely different if only people measured up to the historic requirements of the moment, and therefore determining that the future which will be the responsibility of this generation shall redeem the past, let us now quietly inquire into what must be done in the immediate future to reverse the trend of the immediate past.

Four conditions are absolutely *sine qua non*: unity among the Western allies, deeper understanding and statesmanlike assistance towards the peoples of Asia and Africa, winning the technological competition especially in the matter of armaments, and winning the economic competition in productivity. If the Atlantic world breaks up, whether from internal friction or external pressure, there will be complete disarray in the free world and little will be left to oppose effectively the onward march of Communism anywhere. If the Asians and Africans are not understood on the deepest possible plane and if the Communists prove that they are more friendly and helpful to them, then Asia and Africa will gradually fall to their wiles. If the Communists do better in the technological revolution, especially with respect to weapons, then all will be lost. If the West does not outproduce them, both quantitatively and qualitatively, then the rest of the world will be sucked into their system.

On the subject of Western unity the question is whether the Western nations can morally rise above their narrow nationalisms into a realization that it is their whole civilization that is once more today at stake. I believe they can. Nothing is half as important today as that the spiritual unity of Europe, America, and the Mediterranean world be understood and affirmed.

Putting aside the question of vision, will, softness of living, and unity of effort among the diverse factors involved, there is no doubt whatsoever that, by any standard of measurement, the material and human resources of North and South America of Western Europe, of Japan, of Australasia, and of as much of Africa (and there is no reason why all of Africa should not be included) and Asia as may be persuaded to cooperate, can be so marshaled and coordinated as to outdo the Communist domain in any field of human endeavor, by a ratio of at least five to one. It is all therefore a question of vision, will, overcoming the softness of life, and inducing the necessary unified effort. The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot so order its house as to beat the Communists decisively in every realm.

The West should stand firm at all costs against any further expansion of Communism, including above all the test case of Berlin. In a possible showdown, the obvious strategic handicaps notwithstanding, there should be no question in anybody's mind that the West would not accept a weakening of its position in Berlin. Some Western commentators have darkly hinted that the West would not "fight" over Berlin. It is fair then to ask, over what would the West "fight?"

VI

But merely holding the line is patently not enough. This was the error of the doctrine of containment. It is a passive, defensive, unchallenging policy; and such a policy, except as a necessary first step, is doomed to failure; firstly because this is a dynamic universe; secondly because you are dealing with the most aggresive enemy who will always swirl around and underneath and above all your containing devices; thirdly because a merely defensive or containing attitude means that you are so fat and satisfied yourself that all you wish to achieve is to get away with your own skin, and thus you have no vision, no concern for the rest of the world, and he who has no concern for others will sooner or later find that others, including his erstwhile friends, have no concern for him; and fourthly because you cannot be true to your own freedom if you do not wish and work for freedom for others. It is interesting to note the sort of qualifications that responsible leaders sometimes use for "peace." The Communist spokesmen employ peace without qualification; by which they mean that they should be allowed to carry out their international proletarian revolution "in peace." But the spokesmen of the West speak of peace "with justice and freedom." This is a correct qualification from the Western point of view: peace without justice and freedom is no peace. But what interests me most is, which of the two qualifications do they drop when they wish to use only one? You will find they usually drop freedom and leave justice. This is to me wrong. It could betray an unconscious readiness to sacrifice freedom for what is sentimentally called justice. Both are certainly necessary, but freedom is more fundamental. Freedom creates justice, but not conversely; for justice could be something mechanical without the ultimate freedom of the spirit which demands and creates and recognizes and enforces justice. The West can only be true to itself if it

says, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom and justice," and if it wants to use only one of the two, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom."

It follows that an active policy of liberation is of the essence of any sound Western program for the coming years. When the late John Foster Dulles spoke of liberation shortly after he became Secretary of State, was there a Communist or fellow-traveling or Olympian or softheaded or pacifist or appeasing voice in the world that did not attack him? This synchronization of all these voices against anyone who would dare stand up and actively challenge Communism is one of the strange phenomena of this age. It measures the success of international Communism in intimidating and softening up the free world.

But only a believing, active, sustained and bold looking forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, and a free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. A radical distinction must be made between the great peoples of these countries and their Communist governments. Policies should be devised and pursued in conformity with this distinction. The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the soul of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. As free peoples they have an honorable and equal place in the company of the free. Their energies will be given the freest scope. Their spiritual and cultural contributions to the whole world are awaited and welcomed. With vision and leadership the West should be able to promise them greater material benefits than they have been able to achieve under Communism; benefits which they themselves would acquire by their own free exertions. But they should be promised much more: they should be assured of the freedom to criticize, the freedom to think, the freedom to create, the freedom to live, the freedom to work, the freedom to choose and turn out their own governments, the freedom to lead on the basis of merit in a world freed of the poison of mistruct, subversion, and intrigue. The Russians should be loved for their great spiritual heroes; such as Pushkin, Seraphim, Dostoyevski; and should be constantly reminded of them. The wonderful spiritual genius of Russia should be separated from the alien Marxism with which the Russians are now afflicted. The promise of freedom with equal material benefits to the oppressed should be far more potent than the allurement of a material revolution coupled with enslavement to the free.

VII

The Communists never tire of assuring the rest of the world that "peaceful coexistence" only means that they will realize their unalterable aim of communizing the world without war, and that where they do not succeed in this, they will keep in mind the possibility of nonpeaceful means. They are therefore absolutely determined to dominate the world with or without war. This was explicitly stated by the international Communist congress to which I referred. They therefore speak of the "doomed classes" and of "burying" you and me. We should not be misled by the terms they use, such as "capitalism," "imperialism," "American imperialism," "Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American imperialism," "bourgeois society," etc. These are only revolutionary slogans employed by them to excite and enlist people in their international proletarian revolution. What they are saying behind all this jargon is that the international Communist movement wants to overthrow every existing government, regime, system, outlook, religion, and philosophy, and bring the whole world, all human thought, aspiration, action, and organization, under its absolute control. This is their declared, unchanged, and unchanging objective.

I am yet to hear one Western leader who, assured to his face that he is doomed and will be "buried," can muster enough courage and conviction, if not to use the vulgar phrase "bury" with respect to Communism itself, at least to use some such civilized expression as that the days of Communism are numbered and that Communism will one day be completely forgotten. When Mr. Khrushchev assures Western leaders that their children or at most their grandchildren will all be Communist, I am yet to hear one Western leader who assures Mr. Khrushchev with the same gusto that his children or at least his grandchildren will live to regret and be thoroughly ashamed of the fact that their fathers or grandfathers were ever Communist. And whereas international Communism believes and acts on the belief that the days of everything non-Communist are numbered, my deepest fear is that Western leadership believes no such thing with respect to Communism: my fear is that the softening-up process has reached such an advanced state that all now believe that Communism is here to stay and that therefore the utmost they can do is to manage somehow to "coexist" with it. The deepest crisis of the West is the crisis of faith in its own values: whereas Communism believes that non-Communist values must be eliminated from the face of the earth, and acts on this belief, the West no longer belives that Communist values themselves are doomed to utter destruction and oblivion, and therefore no longer acts on this belief. I am yet to meet or know of one important Western leader who entertains a dynamic vision for the Communist realm which includes the certainty that the children of present-day Communists will have completely repudiated Communism and will have adopted the fundamental values of freedom. Let the West face up to this advanced state of decay in its own soul.

VIII

But what is pre-eminently at stake in Mediterranean-Western civilization today is its human and universal elements. It is man who is denied; it is the affirmation that there is nothing that binds and cements all men into one family that is the prime danger; it is the fragmentation of humanity into endless exclusivisms, whether national or cultural or racial or economic, that poses the deepest challenge. Western civilization is doomed until, jolted out of its complacency, self-satifaction, and sense of apartness, it rediscovers and reaffirms what is genuinely human and universal in its own soul. This means not only economic and technical sharing with Asia and Africa, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual sharing. What is supremely good must be good for all. Those who keep on repeating, as though they discovered a transcendental wisdom, that their ideas, their way of life, their civilization, is "not for export," but only their industrial products, do not know that they are thereby digging the grave of their civilization and the grave of their way of life. Those who come to Asia and Africa and tell them, "you stay where and what you are and we stay where and what we are; we have nothing to give save our goods and gadgets," little know that the day will come, and perhaps is already here, when Asia and Africa will turn upon them and spit in their face. Man can live without goods and gadgets but he cannot live without something human and universal that joins him to his fellow men. A civilization

(Continued on page 7)

A New Look at Anti-Trust Laws

By Msgr. George G. Higgins

Director, Social Action Department, N.C.W.C.

The recent price-fixing scandal in the electrical manufacturing industry came as a great shock to the American public, but it will have been a blessing in disguise if it prompts us to take a new look at the underlying philosophy of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law.

This statute, as amended by the Clayton Act and other more recent laws, is one of our most cherished institutions. The anti-monopoly policy which it represents is a part of our national mythology. Labor and management, liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, are in favor of it and never willingly forego an opportunity to say so.

Jekyll and Hyde

I think it would be fair to say, however, that many of those who publicly support the philosophy of anti-trust legislation really don't believe in it and violate it—with a good conscience—whenever they can do so with impunity.

The average American, in this respect, is a combination of Jekyll and Hyde. Dr. Jekyll believes in free competition and pledges his undying loyalty to the so-called "laws" of the market and to legislation designed to implement these laws. Mr. Hyde is afraid of the rigors of competition and, while publicly supporting the philosophy of anti-trust legislation, will go to the most ingenious lengths, in collusion with his "competitors," to neutralize the "laws" of the market.

It seems to me that there is probably more to be said for Mr. Hyde than there is for Dr. Jekyll. I do not mean to condone the kind of illegal price-fixing recently uncovered which is admittedly indefensible. But does it necessarily follow that unlimited free competition is desirable?

Some economists would answer yes, among them George W. Stocking and Myron W. Watkins, authors of a book entitled "Monopoly and Free Enterprise" which was published several years ago under the respectable auspices of the Twentieth Century Fund.

Messrs. Stocking and Watkins believe wholeheartedly in the philosophy of anti-trust legislation, but they readily admit that the American economy is shot through with various kinds of formal and informal collusion designed to modify the "laws" of competition and to nullify both the letter and the spirit of the Sherman Act and its several amendments. But they are not discouraged by their findings. They still think that anti-trust legislation is a good thing and that it can be made to work effectively. These conclusions, I believe, are open to debate.

Unrestricted Competition

Anti-trust legislation would be a good thing if its only purpose were to prevent monopoly in the anti-social sense in which that word is usually understood. But for many people that isn't its only purpose. Its underlying purpose, according to Stocking and Watkins, is to perpetuate the "impersonal" laws of competition as the directing principles of economic life.

"If society," they say, "is to rely on private enterprise to serve it, all obstacles to its competitive operation must be clearly recognized and rigorously repressed, however sacred may be the vested interests at stake. In its own interest, the public cannot tolerate private groups—either labor or business—strong enough to control markets and disrupt the economy. Monopoly power, in labor's hands or capital's or jointly exercised, is inimical to the general welfare and to democracy."

"All obstacles," they say. Presumably this would include not merely "monopoly power" of an anti-social character but any attempt whatever on the part of labor and management, in cooperation with the government, to establish social justice by regulating competition in the interest of the common good. It would include the so-called Industry Council System as advocated in the social encyclicals and would make a virtue out of uninhibited price warfare.

In rejecting the philosophy of unrestricted competition as advocated by Stocking and Watkins, I am not lightly dismissing the anti-trust tradition of the United States nor suggesting that it can be or should be immediately suspended. Our present anti-trust policy is probably necessary under present and forseeable circumstances, but it isn't by any means a sacred cow. Sooner or later it will have to be re-examined.

My own guess is that it will eventually be found wanting in many respects and will be substantially modified to permit and even encourage the right kind of interference with the so-called "laws" of competition in the interests of justice and the general welfare. Meanwhile if it can discourage or prevent the growth of anti-social price-fixing of the kind which the electrical manufacturing industry has been indulging in, more power to it. (NC Features)

---

in which the human and universal has atrophied can relate itself to others only through force, and force is not an enduring mode of relation, and it can always be broken by force. I am not speaking of diplomacy and propoganda; I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history. I am saying that a civilization is doomed if it is not creatively conscious of something universal and human it can and must give; and I am saying that Western civilization need not be doomed because no civilization conceived and developed the human and universal more than it did.

Most certainly it is not a question of "imposing" anything on anybody; what is genuinely human and universal is never imposed; it is awaited, welcomed, and embraced. What is non-universal in your civilization you keep to yourselves: nobody wants it. Not until the businessman from Manchester or Detroit and the peasant from Iran or India can come together on a much deeper basis than the exchange of goods and money can the West really begin to have a chance in the ferocious competition going on at present for the heart and soul of Asia and Africa. Asia and Africa do not want to deal only with businessmen: they crave for human and spiritual fellowship. There is no exchange of soul, there is no sharing of life and ideas, there is no community of spirit, there is no fellowship of man with man. This is Asia's and Africa's deepest challenge of the West: what have you to give me, not of your trinkets, but of your mind, not of your external husks of your life, but of the substance and marrow of your soul?

Again I am not speaking of the requirements of any immediate emergency: I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history.

The Communists bring in a message. It affects the whole of human life. It provides a total interpretation. They are not afraid to be revolutionary; to say, this is good and that is bad. They are not afraid to shock and challenge the received customs and habits and ideas. They believe in something. The West does not want to be revolutionary, it is afraid of being revolutionary, it does not want to shock and challenge, it is civilized, it is afraid lest it offend. Its trouble therefore may lie precisely in the fact that the content of its belief is very thin. For that which you really believe to be true and human and universal you will want to share with others, you cannot keep under a bushel. The question is whether there is a profound part of your being that you honestly feel you must share with others. The question is whether you honestly feel that you are not complete or happy so long as others are humanly incomplete, that you are not self-sufficient so long as others are miserable or subhuman, a prey to every superstition and every dark fear. The self-sufficiency of the Anglo-Saxon world, its age-old protectedness by seas and oceans, is its greatest present spiritual trial. It has not needed the rest of humanity. But the world has suddenly become physically one, and minds and ideas are much more critically and instantaneously and perpetually interacting with one another. Only he therefore who feels with humanity, who is at one with all conditions of men, who is insufficient and incomplete without them, who is not protected and separated from them, can help them and lead them and love them and be loved by them. The incompleteness of the Communist until he completes himself in others is what gives him the dynamism, the vision, the appeal in the eyes of Asia or Africa.

If there were no universal and human elements in Western civilization the thing would be hopeless. But it happens that the deposit of humanity and universality in this civilization is the richest in the world. The civilization at whose heart pulsate Aristotle and Augustine and Aquinas and Dante and Newton and Shakepeare and Pascal and Kant and Lincoln, the civilization which has been blessed and transformed by Christ, needs only a mighty hand to shake it out of its slumber. And once shaken, once really awakened to the world responsibilities which it and it alone can shoulder, there is nothing it cannot dare and do.

The Americans forsook the old world and their one desire was to forget all about it; the Russians stayed in the old world and never ceased to interact with it East and West and North and South. In this simple difference in fundamental existential orientation the whole secret of the present and the future may be hid. Can the Americans quickly recover the intimacy of relationship with the old world which the Russians never lost?

IX

Negotiations and contacts must never be broken. The United Nations must never be abandoned or weakened. Cultural exchanges must be deepened and enlarged. The Russian people must be brought into intimate spiritual community with the West. Nationalism is not enough, and the new nations must be afforded the opportunity of belonging to larger worlds with wider horizons. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is one of the greatest documents of this age and which owes so much to the Virginia Declaration of Rights must be vigorously held up as a standard of achievement for all nations and all peoples. The West must know its ultimate values and believe in them. The field of struggle must be transposed to the intellectual and spiritual plane. The prevalent softness and complacency must be overcome. The area of decision must not be left to the initiative of the Communists: The West must itself choose it. And so long as the head of international Communism in Moscow remains unchanged, there is no hope.

Can the future redeem the past? I believe it can. Will the future redeem the past? That depends on four things: on depth, on wisdom, on daring, and on leadership. I believe without high leadership daring to act in wisdom and depth the future will not learn from the past. These are things for which we should yearn and work. But in our own effort we may not achieve them. It is only as God wills that depth, wisdom, daring, and leadership be granted the free world at this crucial hour in history, that the future will redeem the past.

EDITOR

Rev. Hubert F. Schiffer, S.J., Associate Professor of Economics, College of Business Administration
Loyola University, New Orleans 18, La.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Henry J. Engler, Dean, College of Business Administration

Rev. Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., Chairman, Department of Sociology

Harriette A. Martire, Assoc. Professor, Department of Education

Bernard J. Offerman, President, New Orleans Young Christian Workers

G. Ralph Smith, Assoc. Prof. of Management, Coll. of Bus. Adm.

Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S.J., Director, Institute of Social Order

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST (published monthly by the Institute of Social Order, Loyola University) is dedicated to the promotion of the private enterprise system, of co-operation and fair dealing between management and labor, of interracial justice and harmony, and, in general, of the Christian reconstruction of our modern socio-economic life. Every issue presents applications of sound principles to the concrete problems of modern life, especially in sociology and economics, by printing condensations of speeches, books and magazine articles by well qualified experts. Thus, **SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST** hopes to stimulate intelligent discussions of vital topics and promote action to strengthen the spirit of personal responsibility.

Subscription: $3.00 — 39 months; $2.00 — 25 months; $1.00 — one year.

Bulk rates: 10-25 copies: 8¢ each; 26-49 copies: 7¢ each; 50 or more copies: 5¢ each.

American Printing Co., Ltd. 424 Camp Street, N. O., La.